

July 28, 2003
Case No.: GB 010034 (7790/245)
Serial No.: 10/084,709
Filed: February 25, 2002
Page 6

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, Examiner Clinger objected to claims 20, 21, 29 and 30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. The Applicant therefore has amended dependent claim 20 into an independent claim including all of the limitations of base claim 14, and maintained the dependence of claim 21 upon claim 20. The Applicant also amended dependent claim 29 into an independent claim including all of the limitations of base claim 22, and maintained the dependence of claim 30 upon claim 29. Allowance of claims 20, 21, 29, and 30 is therefore respectfully requested.

Also in the Final Office Action, Examiner Clinger rejected pending claims 12-19 and 22-28 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein:

- A. Examiner Clinger rejected pending claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,498,586 to *Pankinaho*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Clinger's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 12 and 13 over *Pankinaho*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Pankinaho*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 12 and 13, *Pankinaho* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 12 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 12. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(e) rejection of independent claim 12, because *Pankinaho* fails to disclose, teach or suggest "a first radio circuit connected to said first section at a feed connection point".

First, Examiner Clinger's assertion that *Pankinaho* discloses a conductor with an asymmetrically dividing slot between a section 102 and a section 103 is clearly erroneous, because *Pankinaho* unequivocally teaches conductors 102 and 103 as two separate and distinct conductors that are both individually connected to a feeding point connection 107 via a coupling line 106. See, Pankinaho at column 12, line 47 to column 13, line 5.

July 28, 2003
Case No.: GB 010034 (7790/245)
Serial No.: 10/084,709
Filed: February 25, 2002
Page 7

As to the traversal, *Pankinaho* discloses a planar conductor 102 including a slot 110 asymmetrically dividing conductor 102 into one section connected to a feed connection point 107, and a second section connected to a ground connection point 108. *Pankinaho* further discloses two radio circuit embodiments. In the first radio circuit embodiment as illustrated in FIG. 10, *Pankinaho* discloses a circuit C1, S1 that is connected to neither feed connection point 107 nor ground connection point 108. In a second radio circuit embodiment as illustrated in FIG. 13, *Pankinaho* discloses a circuit C3 and a circuit C2, S2 that are both connected to ground connection point 108. Thus, *Pankinaho* does not teach any radio circuit being connected to feed connection point 107.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Pankinaho* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 12. Therefore, dependent claim 13 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 12. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 13 is allowable over *Pankinaho* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 12 being allowable over *Pankinaho*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Pankinaho* is respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Clinger rejected pending claims 14-19 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,586 to *Pankinaho* in view of European Patent No. 0,993,070 to *Saito*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Clinger's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 14-19 and 22-28 over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Pankinaho* and *Saito*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 14-19 and 22-28, all the claim limitations recited in independent claims 14 and 22 must be taught or suggested by the combination of *Pankinaho* and *Saito*. See, MPEP §2143. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of independent claims 14 and 22,

July 28, 2003
Case No.: GB 010034 (7790/245)
Serial No.: 10/084,709
Filed: February 25, 2002
Page 8

because *Pankinaho* and *Saito* in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest "a second radio circuit connected to said first section at a first ground connection point" as recited in independent claim 14, and "a first radio circuit connected to said first section at a first feed connection point" as recited in independent claim 22.

As to the traversal of independent claim 14, Examiner Clinger has correctly recognized the failure by *Pankinaho* to disclose the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 14. A careful review of *Saito* also reveals that *Saito* fails to teach the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 14. Specifically, as illustrated in FIG. 4, *Saito* teaches a pair of radio circuits connected to a single section of a conductor 2 via a pair of ground connection points 5 and 6. See, Saito at column 8, lines 32-56. Thus, one skilled in the art following the teachings of *Saito* would connect a pair of radio circuits to a single section of conductor 102 of *Pankinaho* via a couple of points on ground connection point 108. However, *Pankinaho* already discloses such an embodiment as illustrated in FIG. 13. Thus, one skilled in the art would not even be motivated to apply the teachings of *Saito* to *Pankinaho*.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 15-19 from independent claim 14. Therefore, dependent claims 15-19 including all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 14. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 15-19 are allowable over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 14 being allowable over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito* is therefore respectfully requested.

As to the traversal of independent claim 22, Examiner Clinger's assertion that *Pankinaho* discloses a conductor with an asymmetrically dividing slot between a section 102 and a section 103 is clearly erroneous, because *Pankinaho* unequivocally teaches conductors 102 and 103 as two separate and distinct conductors that are both

July 28, 2003
Case No.: GB 010034 (7790/245)
Serial No.: 10/084,709
Filed: February 25, 2002
Page 9

individually connected to a feeding point connection 107 via a coupling line 106. See, Pankinaho at column 12, line 47 to column 13, line 5. Pankinaho actually discloses a planar conductor 102 including a slot 110 asymmetrically dividing conductor 102 into a first section connected to a ground connection point 108, and a second section connected to a feed connection point 107. Thus, Pankinaho clearly fails to teach a radio circuit connected to feed connection point 107, and fails to teach an additional feed point connection connected to the first section. As illustrated in FIG. 4, Saito teaches a trio of radio circuits connected to a single section of a conductor 2 via a feed connection point 4 and a ground connection points 5 and 6. See, Saito at column 8, lines 32-56. Thus, while Saito arguably teaches the additional feed point connection connected to the first section, Saito fails to teach a connection of a radio circuit to a feed connection point connected to a difference section of conductor 2. Consequently, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to connect a radio circuit to feed connection point 107 in view of the teachings of Saito.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pankinaho in view of Saito is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 23-28 from independent claim 22. Therefore, dependent claims 23-28 including all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 22. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 23-28 are allowable over Pankinaho in view of Saito for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 22 being allowable over Pankinaho in view of Saito. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pankinaho in view of Saito is therefore respectfully requested.

July 28, 2003
Case No.: GB 010034 (7790/245)
Serial No.: 10/084,709
Filed: February 25, 2002
Page 10

SUMMARY

Examiner Clinger's anticipation and obviousness rejections of claims 12-19 and 22-28 have been obviated by the remarks herein supporting the allowance of claims 12 and 13 over *Pankinaho*, and the allowance of claims 14-19 and 22-28 over *Pankinaho* in view of *Saito*. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-30 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Clinger is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: July 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,
Kevin R. Boyle

U.S. PHILIPS
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, New York 10591
Phone: (914) 333-9606
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Jack D. Slobod
Registration No. 26,236
Attorney for Applicant



Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113